

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 7, 9-21, 24 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-49 of USP 7,230,594; over claims 1-32 of USP 7,184,067; and over claims 1-17 of USP 7,075,242. Three terminal disclaimers are submitted herewith to advance prosecution.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Such claim has been cancelled in view of the amendment to claim 1 discussed below, which is believed to be clear and definite in accordance with the requirements of 35 USC 112.

Claims 1, 4, 9-11, 14, 15, 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Siwinski (Pub. No. US 2002/0186214). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In accordance with claim 1, the present invention requires the use of pixels of an OLED display device having a plurality of OLEDs for emitting different colors of light specifying a gamut wherein one of the OLEDs has a power efficiency or lifetime different from the power efficiency or lifetime of at least one of the other OLEDs, and employs a display driver which generates a converted color display signal for driving the OLEDs in the display, wherein the display driver is responsive to a control signal for controlling the color gamut saturation of light produced by the OLEDs to reduce power consumption or increase lifetime of at least one of the OLEDs. Claim 1 has further been amended to clarify that the color gamut saturation is controlled to limit color-gamut desaturation in the converted color display signal to a maximum value that avoids causing the display to become driven by a completely monochrome display signal. Support for such amendment may be found, e.g., at page 12, lines 20-21. Such feature is enabled in accordance with the disclosed the invention, e.g., by use of different combinations of the plurality of OLEDs to display different given desaturated colors in a response to a converted color display signal, rather than use of only selected single more efficient OLED as may be taught by Siwinski to produce a monochrome image in response to a color input signal.

While Siwinski does teach use of relatively more efficient white light emitting OLED elements in a color OLED display, there is no teaching of driving the OLED elements such that the color gamut saturation is controlled to limit color-gamut desaturation in a converted color display signal to a maximum value that avoids causing the display to become driven by a completely monochrome display signal. While Siwinski does teach employing the white light OLED element in power saving modes, it teaches to employ such white light element in place of the colored light emitting elements (e.g., R,G,B elements) only to display white and shades of gray to provide power savings when displaying images containing a substantial amount of white and/or shades of gray (as suggested, e.g., in paragraphs [0010]-[0014]), or to use the white light elements to display pictoral content in an energy saving monochrome fashion (as suggested, e.g., in paragraphs [0015]-[0016]). These suggestions are different from the present claimed invention wherein desaturated colors are produced in a pixel without changing to a completely monochromatic image. Accordingly, it is clear that Siwinski fails to teach the present invention, and reconsideration of the rejection of such claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 12, 13 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Siwinski (Pub. No. US 2002/0186214). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 7, the Examiner alleges that it is well known to change brightness or color of a display gradually (i.e., using a damping constant) so as to prevent rapid changes in color gamut saturation which would have caused user's annoyance. No evidence of such allegation is provided, however. Further, as discussed above, Siwinski does not teach driving the OLED elements such that the color gamut saturation is controlled to limit color-gamut desaturation in a converted color display signal to a maximum value that avoids causing the display to become driven by a completely monochrome display signal, but rather only teaches displaying a more efficient monochromatic image in place of a color image. Accordingly, even if were known to change brightness or color of some other (unspecified) type of display gradually, there is no teaching or suggestion as to how to accomplish such feature in the display of Siwinski. Regarding claims 12 and 13, the Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to include OLEDs that emit a broad spectrum of light and are overlaid with color filters in

the device of Siwinski so as to generate color light with low cost and simple manufacturing processes. Such modifications, however, would be against the express teachings of Siwinski to employ color light emitting elements with different light emitting efficiencies. Regarding claims 16-20, the Examiner's references to Siwinski's teaching of the use of a white subpixel do not appear to be relevant to the claim 16 requirements of use of an OLED that is outside the gamut defined by the other OLEDs, and more specifically to the requirements of claims 17 and 18 regarding a cyan or yellow light emitting OLED. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has clearly not been made, and reconsideration of these rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested. A prompt and favorable action by the Examiner is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe any remaining issues may be resolved via a telephone interview, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative at the number below to discuss such issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 33,564

Andrew J. Anderson/vjr
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 722-9662
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.